

IN THE SPECIFICATION:

PLEASE AMEND THE SPECIFICATION AS FOLLOWS:

Please replace the paragraph on page 44, lines 2-12 with the following corrected paragraph:

With the GUI operational description of Figs. [[13]]8 and [[14]]9 in mind, and referring back to Fig. 4A and Fig. [[8]]6, consider the marriage of two subnets. In Fig. 4A, where two domains or subnets are shown operating independently, each subnet is shown to have its own master. The DDB of each master node contains an IP address for each node in its own subnet. These two subnets can be physically linked or joined together (married) by the global administrator operating through the GUI, so that any node from either domain can communicate with any node from the other domain. In this married state, although communicatively linked, the nodes from each subnet behave in a manner consistent with their prior independent subnet status. There is no master to master conflict in this situation because each master is not asserting itself (not saying: "I am the master for you") upon nodes from the other subnet.

Please replace the paragraph starting on page 44, line 14 and ending on page 45, line 3 with the following corrected paragraph:

Using Fig. 4A as an example, in a subnet marriage, the two masters (nodes 1 and 6) remain within their respective domains, and the domain boundaries around domains 401 and 402 remain intact. However, there will be an operative coupling, a

communication link or bus (not shown), that connects nodes 1 – 4 inclusive from domain 401 to nodes 5 - 8 inclusive from domain 402. For example, node 3 could talk to node 8, etc. Accordingly, if an IP address from one of the nodes from one of the subnets, for example node 2 from domain 1, is inserted into a web browser's URL slot on the GUI terminal screen, and a scan operation of this marriage of two subnets is performed, then nodes from both subnets will be discovered. (This instant scan is similar to, but different from, that shown in Fig. [[13]]8. The scan of Fig. [[13]]8 was for the purpose of discovering available nodes outside of a domain with which to configure or re-configure that domain, but this instant scan is to discover nodes currently existing within a domain and is performed through another dialog, not shown).

Please replace the paragraph starting on page 45, line 5 and ending on page 45, line 17 with the following corrected paragraph:

The result of this instant scan will cause node 2 to initiate an update to its master node 1, advising it of new nodes in the domain. Master node 1 will update its DDB with all node information from all nodes in both subnets. But, when master node 1 propagates its update to all nodes from both subnets, those nodes which comprise domain 402 reject the update. Those nodes have their own master node, master node 6. Because of the master to node handshake, nodes 5, 6, 7, and 8 will reject this update request since the IP address of master node 6 differs from the IP address of master node 1 (see Fig. [[8]]6, block 605). The global administrator will be able to see this at the GUI by looking at an eventlog. Master node 1 will mark nodes 5, 6, 7, and 8 in its DDB as remote nodes within its subnet. Likewise, master node 6 will mark in its DDB nodes 1, 2, 3, and 4 as

remote nodes within its subnet. Thereafter, until further intervention by the global administrator, both sets of nodes co-exist in a marriage of subnets while retaining their individual autonomy.